

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,396	12/28/2001	Hiroshi Chikuma	040679-1425	2090
22428	7590 09/24/2003			
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW			EXAMINER	
			ROSENBAUM, IRENE CUDA	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3726	10
			DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003	Ų

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ě						
,		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/029,396	CHIKUMA ET AL.			
Of	fice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Irene Cuda-Rosenbaum	3726			
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communication app ly	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE MAILIN - Extensions of after SIX (6) N - If the period fo - If NO period fo - Failure to repl - Any reply rece	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY INC. NED STATUTORY INC. NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY INC. NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)□ Resp	onsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>				
2a)☐ This	action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of						
•	(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.	un from consideration				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
<u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.] Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement				
Application Pa	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
9)☐ The sp	ecification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The dra	awing(s) filed on is/are: a)∏ accep	oted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exar	miner.			
Appli	cant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The pro	oposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	ved by the Examiner.			
If app	proved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.				
12) <u></u> The oa	th or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under	35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)⊠ Ackno	wledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a)⊠ All	b) Some * c) None of:					
1.⊠	Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2.	Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Application	on No			
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•			
14) Acknow	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
	ne translation of the foreign language pro vledgment is made of a claim for domesti	• •				
Attachment(s)	_	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
2) Notice of Dra	erences Cited (PTO-892) ftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) isclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/029,396

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 2 and 7 there is no proper antecedent basis for "the header positioning member". Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter referred to as AAPA) in view of either Mantegazza et al(5954125)or Pierce (5,966,809).

AAPA teaches the method essentially as claimed but lacks a teaching of using a set base to hold the tubes. However, both Mantegazza et al (see column 3, lines 7-12, and the related figure) and Pierce (column 7, lines 13-15, and figure 1) teach a base to hold the tubes during the process. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by AAPA by

Application/Control Number: 10/029,396

Art Unit: 3726

using a set base as claimed, since to do so is old and well known in the art for the purpose of maintaining the correct positioning of the tubes during manufacture.

Claims 5-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of either Mantegazza et al or Pierce as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of Makino et al (6,095,239).

AAPA in view of either Mantegazza or Pierce teach the method essentially as claimed but lack a teaching of manufacturing the second heat exchanger in conjunction with the first heat exchanger as claimed. Makino teach that it is old and well known to manufacture the two heat exchanger in combination as claimed for the purpose of achieving better heat exchange. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by AAPA in view of either Mantegazza or Pierce by making a combination heat excahangerr as claimed, since to do so is old and well known in the art for the purpose of achieving better heat exchange, as taught by Makino et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim2-3 and 7-8 are would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Cuda-Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 703-308-1792. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 308-1148. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1148.

ICR

Jels M. An 3721